

**U.S. Application No. 09/837,437
Reply to final Office Action dated October 5, 2005**

RSW9-2001-0006-US1

REMARKS

I. Summary of the Office Action and this Reply

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 14-31 are pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 6, 15, 16, 19, 21, 23, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), asserting that such claims are anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,711,283 to Soenksen ("Soenksen"). The Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), asserting that such claims are obvious over Soenksen in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,717,869 to Moran ("Moran"). The Examiner has rejected claims 11, 14, 18, 22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), asserting that such claims are obvious over Soenksen in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,982,345 to Callahan et al. ("Callahan"). Claims 14, 17, 25-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over various combinations of Soenksen, U.S. Patent No. 5,553,225 to Perry ("Perry"), U.S. Patent No. 5,263,134 to Paal ("Paal") and/or Callahan.

II. Applicant Initiated Examiner Interview

The Examiner is thanked for the telephone interview conducted on November 7, 2005, for which a form PTOL-413A was provided. In summary thereof, the pending 102 and 103 rejections were discussed.

In particular, agreement was reached that Soenksen does not disclose a slider "comprising a second portion positioned outside of and adjacent to said image" as recited in claim 16.

Further, the undersigned argued that, in Soenksen, the zoom image 104 does not fill zoom window 124, that there is no automatic re-zooming of the zoom image to fill

U.S. Application No. 09/837,437

RSW9-2001-0006-US1

Reply to final Office Action dated October 5, 2005

window 124 after resizing of the zoom region 106, and that Soenken does not disclose that user interaction to resize a slider/zoom region necessarily results in a change in zoom factor of the image displayed in the display window/zoom window 124 such that the viewed image fills the display window/zoom window. Further, the undersigned argued that this is true notwithstanding the disclosure at col. 22, lines 28-29 regarding the apparently automatic resizing of the zoom region 106 as a result of user interaction to change the zoom factor for an image viewed in the zoom window. In other words, the undersigned asserts that Soenksen is interpretable to disclose that user interaction in resizing of the zoom region 106 results only in a change in scope, at the same zoom factor, of what is viewed in a zoom window of the same size, e.g. because only a smaller scope will fit within a zoom window of a certain size if the zoom region is increased and the zoom factor is maintained. Note proportions of zoom image in Fig. 5A and 5B. The Examiner indicated a desire to reconsider; agreement was not reached.

Further still, the undersigned argued that Callahan does not disclose, particularly at col. 2, lines 19-36, the claimed intersection of multiple sliders, e.g. as recited in claim 11. The Examiner's attention was drawn to col. 2, lines 5-18, col. 5, lines 9-19 and col. 6, lines 5-16. Agreement was reached that Callahan does not disclose the claimed intersecting sliders.

III. Response to Section 102 Rejections

A rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is proper only if each and every element of the claim is found in a single prior art reference. MPEP § 2131.

**U.S. Application No. 09/837,437
Reply to final Office Action dated October 5, 2005**

RSW9-2001-0006-US1

Claim 16

Claim 16 is directed to a graphical user interface for displaying a user-selected portion of an image. The interface includes a slider "a second portion positioned outside of and adjacent to said image." See grab bar 342, Figure 3. This is neither taught nor suggested by any of the cited art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3 and 6

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for displaying a user-selected portion of an image. The method includes "displaying a first slider . . . superimposed over said image to define a corresponding first portion of said image within a boundary of said first slider; displaying said first portion . . . enlarged relative to said image to fill said display area of said certain size."

It appears from Figure 5A that the zoom image portion 104 does not fill the zoom window 124. For at least this reason, Soenksen fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1.

Additionally, claim 1 recites "displaying said first slider as resized, said resized first slider being displayed superimposed over said image to define a corresponding second portion of said image within said boundary of said slider; and displaying said second portion . . . enlarged relative to said image to fill said display area of said certain size." Displaying an image as enlarged to fill a display area is neither taught nor suggested by Soenksen, as discussed above.

**U.S. Application No. 09/837,437
Reply to final Office Action dated October 5, 2005**

RSW9-2001-0006-US1

Further, the claimed method is such that resizing of the slider results in a change in size of the selected portion corresponding to the slider, and a resulting change in a zoom factor when a selected portion of a different size is displayed in a display area of a same size. This is neither taught nor suggested by Soenksen, as discussed above. For at least this additional reason, Soenksen fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1.

Claims 3 and 6 depend from claim 1.

For at least these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3 and 6 are requested respectfully.

Claim 15

Independent claim 15 is directed to a graphical user interface that includes "a display area for displaying a portion of said image, . . . a slider superimposed over and translatable over said image, . . . wherein said slider is variable in size . . . , said portion of said image filling said display area of said certain size for each corresponding scope."

Thus, the claimed method is such that resizing of the slider results in a change in size of the selected portion corresponding to the slider, and a resulting change in a zoom factor when a selected portion of a different size is displayed in a display area of a same size. This is neither taught nor suggested by Soenksen, as discussed above with reference to claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 are requested respectfully.

**U.S. Application No. 09/837,437
Reply to final Office Action dated October 5, 2005**

RSW9-2001-0006-US1

Claims 19, 21, 23 and 25

Dependent claim 19 is directed to a method for displaying a user-selected portion of an image. The method includes, after accepting user input to resize one of a first and second slider to define a second portion of an image at their intersection, "displaying in a display area of a certain size said second portion of said image, said second portion of said image filling said display area." This is neither taught nor suggested by Soenksen, as discussed above with reference to claim 1.

Independent claim 21 is directed to a system including "means for displaying any selected portion of said image in said display area to fill said display area of said certain size, a scope of said portion of said image corresponding to a size of said first slider as resized."

Independent claim 23 is directed to a computer program product including "computer readable program code for displaying any selected portion of said image in a display area of a certain size to fill said display area, a scope of said portion of said image corresponding to a size of said first slider as resized."

Accordingly, independent claims 21 and 23 are directed to a system and computer program product for displaying a user-selected portion of an image. The system/product displays portions of an image selected by a resizable slider. Regardless of the size of the selected portion, the selected portion is displayed in a display area of a certain fixed size. Accordingly, any resizing of that slider, and corresponding resizing of a selected portion of that image, results in display of the resized portion in a display area that does not change in size. Accordingly, the selected portion is scaled accordingly for display in the display area of a fixed size. This is neither taught nor

U.S. Application No. 09/837,437

RSW9-2001-0006-US1

Reply to final Office Action dated October 5, 2005

suggested by the cited art, as discussed above with reference to claim 1. Claims 21

and 23 are thus patentable for reasons similar to those set forth above for claim 1.

Claim 25 depends from claim 23 and is likewise patentable.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19, 21, 23 and 25 are
requested respectfully.

IV. Response to Section 103 Rejections

A section 103 rejection is proper only if all claim limitations are taught or
suggested by the cited art. MPEP §2143.

Claims 11 and 25-28

Claim 11 depends from claim 1 and is likewise patentable for the reasons set
forth above.

Additionally, claim 11 recites "displaying a second slider, said second slider
being distinct from said first slider and being superimposed over said image, both said
first slider and said second slider being displayed in two-dimensional space, said
second slider cooperating with said first slider to define said first and second portions of
said image at an intersection of said second slider and said first slider . . ." This is
neither taught nor suggested by Soenksen or Callahan, alone or in combination. As
discussed above, Callahan neither teaches nor suggests such sliders.

Claims 25-28 depend from claim 11.

For at least these additional reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the
rejections of claims 11 and 25-28 are requested respectfully.

U.S. Application No. 09/837,437
Reply to final Office Action dated October 5, 2005

RSW9-2001-0006-US1

Claims 18, 20 and 22

Independent claim 18 includes recitations similar to those of claim 1 and is likewise patentable.

Additionally, claim 18 recites "displaying a second slider that is variable in size according to user input, both said first slider and said second slider being displayed in two-dimensional space, at least a portion of said second slider being superimposed over said image and intersecting said first slider within said two-dimensional space, said second slider cooperating with said first slider to define a first portion of said image at an intersection of said first slider and said second slider, said first slider being translatable and resizable along a first axis within said two-dimensional space that is orthogonal to a second axis within said two-dimensional space along which said second slider is translatable and resizable." Accordingly, claim 18 further includes recitations similar to those of claim 11, and is further patentable for similar reasons.

Claims 20 and 22 depend from claim 18.

For at least these additional reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18, 20 and 22 are requested respectfully.

Claims 8, 9, 14, 17, 24, 29 and 30

Claims 8, 9, 14, 17, 24, 29 and 30 depend from claims believed allowable, as discussed above, and are thus likewise allowable.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 8, 9, 14, 17, 24, 29 and 30 are requested respectfully.

U.S. Application No. 09/837,437
Reply to final Office Action dated October 5, 2005

RSW9-2001-0006-US1

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 14-31 to be patentable and the application in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request issuance of a Notice of Allowance. If any issues remain, the undersigned requests a telephone interview prior to the issuance of an action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 11, 2005



Gregory S. Bernabeo
Registration No. 44,032

Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP
2600 Aramark Tower
1101 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950
Telephone: 215-923-4466
Facsimile: 215-923-2189